

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-14 are currently pending.

Claims 2 and 7 are cancelled.

New claims 30-33 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found generally throughout the instant specification.

Claims 15-26 are withdrawn from consideration.

**35 U.S.C. 102(b) (Sramek Patent)**

In the May 1, 2003 office action, the Examiner states that claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sramek, U.S. Patent Number 4,861,583. The Examiner notes that Sramek teaches hot curling hair treatment compositions that comprise polyethylene oxide polymers that have a molecular weight between 20,000 to about 250,000, and further that Sramek discloses several optional materials such as surfactants, wetting agents, dyes and perfumes. The Examiner states that applicant's claims are anticipated specifically by examples 1 and 15 of Sramek.

In full response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 so as to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sramek.

Claim 1 of the amended application teaches polyethylene oxide with a molecular weight greater than 250,000. Claim 8 of the amended application teaches polyethylene oxide with a molecular weight in the range of about 250,000 to 8,000,000.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by the cited prior art reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-14

are in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Further, Claim 11 is not anticipated by Sramek. Sramek does not teach an anti-microbial agent, but does teach ethanol or a similar alcohol, which the Examiner has noted as a potential anti-microbial agent. Sramek's disclosure of ethanol as a cosmetically suitable solvent teaches away from the use of anti-microbial agents because the present invention involves the use of an anti-microbial agent impregnated in a cleaning composition, capable of retarding microbial growth on a surface, and capable of removal at room temperature via the use of a solvent.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended application is not anticipated by the cited prior art reference and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) (Sramek Patent)**

In the May 1, 2003 office action, the Examiner states that claims 5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sramek. The Examiner notes that Sramek differs from the present invention in that there is no direct teaching to compositions that actually contain an anionic surfactant, a coloring agent, or Polyethylene Oxide with a density of about 0.5 grams/mL. The Examiner also states, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the disclosure of Sramek as motivation to make aqueous compositions that further comprise anionic surfactants and coloring agents, because both come within the broad disclosure of the reference and are notoriously well known in the art to be used in such compositions.

In full response, Applicant has cancelled Claim 7 and respectfully submits that claims 5 and 9 as amended are patentable over Sramek.

Claim 5 recites anionic surfactants. Sramek teaches only cationic and nonionic surfactants, which are the most common surfactants for personal care applications. Accordingly, Sramek teaches away from anionic surfactants.

Claim 7 has been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully submits additionally that the compound the of the presently claimed invention is non-obvious because of unexpected results, namely an effective cleaning composition capable of impregnation, and further capable of removal using solvents at room temperature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended application is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art reference and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Sramek.

**35 U.S.C. 102(b) (Murayama Patent)**

In the May 1, 2003 office action, the Examiner states that claims 2-3, 5, and 9-14 are rejected as being anticipated by Murayama, U.S. Patent No. 5,401,495. The Examiner notes that the Murayama patent teaches teeth whitener compositions and that Applicant's claims are anticipated over example 4.

In full response, Applicant has cancelled Claim 2, and added new claims 30-33 so as to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murayama.

Claims 30-32 of the amended application teach ethylene dioxide, carboxymethyl hydroxyethyl cellulose, and hydroxyethyl cellulose as the polyethylene oxide. Claim 33 of the amended application teaches dodecyl benzene sulfonate as the anionic surfactant. Example 4 of Murayama teaches only Carboxymethylcellulose as a water-soluble ether.

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 30-33 are not anticipated by the cited prior art reference. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 5, and 9-14 are in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended application is not anticipated by the cited prior art reference and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Murayama.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) (Sintov Patent)**

In the May 1, 2003 office action, the Examiner states that claims 2-3, 5, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sintov, U.S. Patent No. 5,425,953. The Examiner notes that Sintov discloses aqueous polymer compositions for tooth bleaching and other dental uses. The compositions can comprise from 5%-15% by weight of hydroxypropyl cellulose as disclosed in the abstract, examples, and Claim 10 of Sintov.

The Examiner also notes that Sintov differs from the present invention in a number of ways, such as: 1) there is no direct teaching (i.e. by way of an example) to an aqueous composition that actually comprises hydroxypropyl cellulose within Applicant's claimed

concentration range, and 2) the use of additional agents such as a coloring agent, an anionic surfactant, or a fragrance are not directly taught.

However, the Examiner continues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the disclosure of Sintov as motivation to actually make thickened aqueous dental compositions that contain Applicant's claimed concentrations of hydroxypropyl cellulose, since such concentrations are disclosed by Claim 10 of the cited reference. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the disclosure of Sintov as motivation to actually make thickened aqueous dental compositions that contain an anionic surfactant, a coloring agent, or a fragrance, since such are deemed to come within the broad disclosure of Sintov.

In full response, applicant has cancelled Claim 2 and respectfully submits that claims 3, 5, and 9-14 as amended are now patentable over Sintov.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 5, and 9-14 are in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Sintov.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the application and claims as amended are now in condition for allowance and that the amended claims are patentable over the prior art.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits favorable action on all pending claims, namely Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, and 30-33.

If for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. 706.03(d) and 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

The fee for a three-month extension of time for a small entity is FOUR HUNDRED SEVENTY FIVE DOLLARS (\$475.00). A check including the amount of FOUR HUNDRED SEVENTY FIVE DOLLARS (\$475.00) is enclosed herewith to cover the fee.

The fee for a Request for Continued Application for a small entity is THREE HUNDRED EIGHTY FIVE DOLLARS (\$385.00). A check including the amount of THREE HUNDRED EIGHTY FIVE DOLLARS (\$385.00) is enclosed herewith to cover the fee.

Respectfully submitted,  
STEIN & STEIN

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Steven B. Stein

Reg. No.: 43,159

11/3/2003

**Patent App. Number 09/751,160**  
**Attorney Docket No.: PA00-1010-Y**

STEIN & STEIN  
164 Route 10 West  
Succasunna, NJ 07876  
(973) 252-1080

Date: November 3, 2003

**MARKED VERSION OF CLAIMS**

1. (Twice Amended). A composition for coating a surface comprising (a) a solution of polyethylene oxide in water, wherein the polyethylene oxide has a molecular weight greater than 250,000, and (b) a surfactant, wherein the composition is capable of being removed from the surface at about room temperature with a solvent.
2. (Cancelled) A composition for coating a surface comprising (a) about 0.1 to 10 weight percent of a water soluble ether and (b) a surfactant, wherein the composition is capable of being removed from the surface at about room temperature with a solvent.
3. (Twice Amended). The composition according to claim 1 [or claim 2], wherein the solvent is water.
4. The composition according to claim 1, wherein the polyethylene oxide concentration is about 0.01 to 50 weight percent.
5. (Amended) The composition according to claim [3]1, wherein the surfactant is an anionic surfactant.



6. The composition according to claim 1, wherein the polyethylene oxide is a high molecular weight polyethylene oxide.
7. (Cancelled) The composition according to claim 1, wherein the polyethylene oxide is of a density of about 0.5 grams/ml.
8. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1, wherein the polyethylene oxide is of a molecular weight in the range of about [100,000]250,000 to 8,000,000.
9. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1 [or claim 2], further comprising a coloring agent.
10. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1 [or claim 2], further comprising a fragrancng agent.
11. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1 [or claim 2], further comprising an anti-microbial agent.

12. (Amended) The composition according to claim 1 [or claim 2], further comprising an anti-soiling agent.
13. The composition according to claim 12, wherein the anti-soiling agent is a detergent.
14. The composition according to claim 12, wherein the anti-soiling agent concentration is about 0.01 to 99.9 weight percent.
30. (New) The composition according to Claim 1, wherein the Polyethylene Oxide is Ethylene Dioxide.
31. (New) The composition according to Claim 1, wherein the Polyethylene Oxide is Carboxymethyl Hydroxyethyl Cellulose.
32. (New) The composition according to Claim 1, wherein the Polyethylene Oxide is Hydroxyethyl Cellulose.
33. (New) The composition according to Claim 1, wherein the surfactant is Dodecyl Benzene Sulfonate.